

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application; claims 16-20 are newly added. Claims are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label number(s), and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language. The claims are not narrowed in scope and no new matter is added.

The applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s).

The Office action objects to the drawings. The applicant respectfully traverses this objection.

The Office action asserts that the drawings fail to show the claimed feedback system. The applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. FIG. 3 illustrates an example coupling of the current measuring line 34 to the display element 2 via switch 32 while control line 6 controls the current to the display element 2, and FIG. 4 illustrates an example feedback system for controlling the control line 6 based on the current measuring line 34.

The applicant thanks the Examiner for providing information about recommended section headings. However, the applicant respectfully declines to add the headings. Section headings are not statutorily required for filing a non-provisional patent application under 35 USC 111(a), but are only guidelines that are suggested for applicant's use. (See Miscellaneous Changes in Patent Practice, Response to comments 17 and 18 (Official Gazette, August 13, 1996) [Docket No: 950620162-6014-02] RIN 0651-AA75 ("Section 1.77 is permissive rather than mandatory. ... [T]he Office will not require any application to comply with the format set forth in 1.77").

The Office action objects to the form of claims 5-11; these claims are correspondingly amended herein.

The Office action rejects claims 1-3 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Pae et al. (EP1221686, hereinafter Pae). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-11 depend, claims a display device that includes a first switch enabling power from a power supply line to be supplied to a display element and a second switch for routing current from a current-measurement supply line to the display element, the first and second switches being operated in complementary manner.

The Office action acknowledges that Pae fails to teach a first switch enabling power from a power supply line to be supplied to a display element, and asserts that it would be an obvious design choice to use a first switch enabling power from a power supply line so that the storage capacitor can hold fixed gate source voltage. The applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion, because it does not address the claimed limitations of the first switch.

Of particular note, the applicant specifically claims that the second switch that routes current from the current measurement supply line is operated in a complementary manner to the first switch. That is, the routing of current to the current measurement supply line occurs when power from the power supply line is not enabled by the first switch. Pae's system will not function if the power from the power supply line is not enabled while the current is routed from the current-measurement supply line.

Because Pae does not teach or suggest a switch for enabling power from a power supply line to be supplied to a display element, and because the asserted modification to Pae would render Pae's device unsuitable for its intended function, the applicant respectfully maintains that the rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Pae should be withdrawn.

Claim 12, upon which claims 13-15 depend, claims a method that includes applying a voltage to a drive transistor to drive a current through the display element, the current being drawn from a current-measurement supply line, and applying a stored voltage to the gate of the drive transistor and drawing current from a power supply line to illuminate the display element.

The Office action asserts that Pae teaches applying a voltage to a drive transistor to drive a current through the display element, the current being drawn from a current-measurement supply line, at figures 2 and 3, and paragraph [0050]. The applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

Pae clearly teaches that the current that is provided to the display element is drawn from voltage supply line VDD. At the cited text, Pae clearly teaches that the driving transistor (P0) drives the display element (OEL):

"The ramp voltage value  $V_{ramp}$  constantly maintained is higher than the threshold voltage value of the driving transistor that drives the emitting pixel OEL, so that it is possible to solve a problem of the luminance deviation of the emitting pixel OEL according to the threshold voltage deviation of the driving transistor." (Pae [0050].)

As clearly illustrated in Pae's FIG. 2, Pae's driving transistor (P0) draws the driving current from voltage source VDD, and not from a current-measuring supply line. If Pae's driving transistor (P0) was coupled to draw current from the current measurement line Iout, Pae's device would not work.

Because Pae does not teach or suggest applying a voltage to a drive transistor to drive a current through the display element, the current being drawn from a current-measurement supply line, and because the asserted coupling of Pae's drive transistor to the current-measurement line would render Pae's device unsuitable for its intended function, the applicant respectfully maintains that the rejection of claims 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Pae should be withdrawn.

The Office action rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Pae and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 4 is dependent upon claim 1. In this rejection, the Office action relies upon Pae for teaching the elements of claim 1. As noted above, Pae fails to teach the elements of claim 1, and thus the applicant respectfully maintains that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies upon Pae for teaching the elements of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/  
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.  
Reg. 41,508  
804-493-0707

**Please direct all correspondence to:**  
Corporate Counsel  
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001